

mother would surely die. However, in trying to save the mother, the child's life would be put in jeopardy.

Surgery was performed on the woman, expecting that there was this problem at the appendectomy site, but no evidence of an anastomotic leak was found. The child was delivered but, sadly, died of extreme prematurity; but the mother, after the operation, immediately improved, and within 24 hours, was nearly well and was discharged from the hospital a few days later.

After these tragic events, an attorney sued Dr. Hatton on behalf of the shocked and saddened family of this young woman. Every practitioner involved in the case was sued, but Dr. Hatton was the ultimate target. The case went to trial and Dr. Hatton prevailed. What the attorney should have recognized at the point of the depositions, had he not been blinded by greed, was the fact that, in this tragic and sad case, there was no negligent party.

However, that attorney continued to drag Dr. Hatton through a long and arduous legal battle, and delayed the time that that family could eventually heal from their psychological wounds. This was a costly, time-consuming, and an emotional process for both the doctor and the family, all for the agenda of a third party.

There are thousands of other doctors with similar stories. The crisis is at a breaking point. Doctors are being driven from their practices, leaving the Nation with a serious health professional shortage. The legal environment in which doctors must work is lopsided to favor a very narrow special interest group, that of the trial lawyer. Patients are losing access to specialized care that they need because doctors are being driven out of business.

Trial lawyers prey on vulnerable patients and doctors rarely in pursuit of justice, but frequently in pursuit of material gain. Nearly every State in the country now faces this crisis. A national solution is needed now. Fortunately for us, H.R. 5, which we will debate this week, will immediately address this problem by providing the national solution that is needed when it comes to the floor. I urge passage of H.R. 5.

GOVERNMENT PENSION OFFSET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk with my colleagues on a very controversial provision within the Social Security Protection Act which the House will be considering on the floor tomorrow. This legislation includes a number of important provisions to defend Social Security against fraud and abuse, and ensure that disabled beneficiaries are protected.

Unfortunately, this legislation fails to offer any protections to an equally important population: public employ-

ees who suffer at the hands of an unfair provision known as the government pension offset. In States where some public employees are not covered by Social Security, such as Texas, the government pension offset reduces spousal benefits by two-thirds, and, in some cases, eliminates these benefits altogether.

This provision unfairly penalizes public servants such as schoolteachers, firefighters, and police officers who educate our children, protect us from harm, and care for us during emergencies. This is a particular burden for widows, especially our public school teachers who had planned their retirement benefits thinking they would receive a full spousal benefit, because their spouses did pay into the Social Security trust fund. The only way they can escape this unfair penalty is by working their last days in a job covered by Social Security and their retirement system.

Unfortunately, so many school districts and some law enforcement agencies in Texas do not have both their pension plan plus Social Security. Unfortunately, the legislation we are considering tomorrow would prevent teachers from using this benefit, forcing them to work 5 more years in order to receive a full spousal benefit. In other words, they would have to leave their jobs at the school district which may not be part of the Social Security system, because in 1983 Congress allowed public employees not to be included, to then work for a school district that is both under the teacher retirement system in Texas and Social Security for 5 years.

We should not punish teachers by stripping away this right unless we address the underlying problem, the unfair government pension offset, the GPO. The widow's benefit is vital to many individuals in my district, especially public school teachers, who have worked their whole lives trying to educate our children. It is not by their choice that they happen to work in a school district that does not pay Social Security; it is school district decisions by the board Members.

I have received literally hundreds of phone calls and messages from constituents who are hurt by this provision. They planned their retirement thinking that they would receive a pension benefit or spousal benefit if their husbands or wives die.

Let us be clear: Most of the impact of this provision is on women. At the time they chose their profession, teaching may have been the best opportunity for females; but they retire, to find that they are not eligible for their husband's benefit, their widow's benefit, because they receive a public pension that was not covered under Social Security. By that time, it is too late.

I could give many examples of people who have worked many years teaching our children, working as a custodian in our school districts, or helping serve food to our children whose husband

passed away and they find out, well, sorry, you do not pay Social Security, even though your husband did all those years, and now you do not receive but a very small amount, or none, of Social Security widow's benefits.

H.R. 743, that is on the floor tomorrow, will make it harder for teachers and other public servants to get the benefits they deserve, but it does nothing to address the unfair system that created this situation in the first place.

I encourage my colleagues to stand up for public servants by opposing this legislation tomorrow, and to work instead to eliminate the government pension offset, the GPO. I am a strong supporter of legislation introduced by my colleagues, the gentlemen from California, Mr. McKEON and Mr. BERMAN, which would eliminate the government pension offset and the windfall elimination provision, another quirk in Social Security that hurts public employees. That is legislation we should be considering tomorrow, but we are not.

I know my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON), has been a champion on this issue and is planning on introducing legislation which would provide a remedy for the government offset. We should consider these bills before we consider H.R. 743.

I urge my colleagues and the leadership to act on these bills and finally solve the government pension offset problem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EDWARDS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANS STILL VITAL FOR JUSTICE IN UNIVERSITY ATTENDANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to share that today is the third anniversary of the march on Tallahassee in Tallahassee, Florida. It took place in 2000, to stand not only for justice by affirmative action in this State, but ultimately this country.

The adoption of affirmative action programs in the '60s reflected our Nation's aspirations to overcome long-entrenched injustices and become a society of equal opportunity, or at least to make sure that everyone has the opportunity in higher education that would like to have it.

Now, not only the President but the Governor of the State of Florida, Jeb Bush, has put forth a brief to the Supreme Court fighting against equal opportunity for all. I think it is important that we as Americans come together at a time such as this and commend those that have come forward.

One of the things that the State of Florida talked about as it relates to moving away from affirmative action was moving away from equal opportunity, not only for race or gender, but also moving away from what we believe makes us Americans.

I think it is important for us to note that some of these programs are more harmful than helpful. In Florida, they have the Talented 20 program. If this was to become the law of the land and philosophy of the land, if the Supreme Court does not uphold the Michigan decision, it is important, it is important that we make sure that we have as many inclusionary opportunities as possible, especially for those that are attending school for the first time.

In Florida, under the Talented 20 program, if you have school A, and school A is a school where the GPA of top 20 percent stops at a 3.5, and school B, where the top 20 shuts off at 3.3; say you have 2 students, they play soccer together, two girls, and you have one student in school A that will have a 3.4 GPA, and the one in school B has a 3.4 GPA, this school A student does not go to school and this one does, based on the capability of other students in their school.

The top 20 cuts off at different locations, different areas in every school; so a child should not be penalized on the fact that they go to a school that has more magnet programs or Rhodes scholars, future Rhodes scholars, whatever the case may be. They should not be penalized. When we move away from the practice of affirmative action, using race among many factors, we get into a very gray area that is going to end up hurting more Americans than helping them.

As we start looking at the fact that, I must say, my President and yours was able to get into school under a legacy, I think it is important that we remember that everyone did not have the opportunity to have a parent or someone that was able to get a dormitory named after them to be able to get into school. That means every American.

I share with people constantly that it is very, very important that we remember that education is the number one key to help individuals provide for their families. I tell individuals when I go to speak at Rotary Clubs or at the Kiwanis Club, if they have a wife or daughter, which qualifies every man in this country, then they should be for affirmative action.

The Michigan case is supported by General Schwarzkopf and many others that are noted throughout the military, because diversity makes our country great and strong. I think it is important that Members, not only of this Congress but definitely of the Supreme Court and just everyday Americans, need to understand that if we have to get a football or a basketball, or we have to take our kids to an arts program where they can learn how to sing or what have you, dance well, to get into our institutions of higher education, I think that is the wrong thing.

Universities and institutions of higher learning would like to be able to have the opportunity to say that this child, based on the fact that they have great ability, will be a great asset, not only to our university but also to our society. I think it is important. I think it should not be just based on sports, and it should not be based on the fact that someone can sing or run. I think it is important that we remember that children and young people that want to move on into higher education should be able to do so based on their academic ability, and not on the academic ability of others.

□ 1945

So I think we really need to really look close to these fast, quick programs, affirmative action, things that are untested, unproven, and look at what the University of Michigan has put forth.

I commend the brief that has been put forth by Members of Congress supporting affirmative action, of supporting the Michigan case in the Supreme Court. I think we, as Americans, it brings us together. It does not divide us. When we start looking at voices and hearing voices that are willing to use race and use divisive kinds of languages like preference, things of that nature, divides us as Americans. I think it is important we redefine preference.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members of the House to really look close as we look at this national debate over inclusion, this national debate of education on behalf of fair play, making sure that every young person in our country has an opportunity to quality education and the best universities that we have that serve us. We do not want to go back to the day like my mother, who served in this House, in this Congress, who had to go to the University of Michigan not by choice but just on the fact that she could not get into an institution in Florida to be able to receive a master's degree. I do not think that we will get to that point because I know that Americans will stand up, and I am glad. And I commend the University of Michigan and the corporations and our men and women that are sponsoring them.

ECONOMIC MYTH OF WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk tonight about an economic myth. There is a myth that has been around a long time and that is that war benefits an economy.

The argument goes that when a country is at war it will create jobs and create economic growth. This is a myth. During the time of World War II and following, they claim that the Depression ended, finally ended with the start

of the second world war. And this is not true either because a lot of men were drafted and put into the military. Unemployment rates obviously went down, but there was no improvement in the economy.

Economic growth and really the ending of the Depression did not end until after World War II. So it is wrong to think there is an economic benefit coming from any kind of a war.

There are a lot of shortcomings from a war. During wartime it is much more common to have inflation, and the money presses are running so we can expect inflation from the military build up and the possible war that we are facing. Also, during wartime there is a bigger challenge to the currency of that nation that is at war, and already we see that the dollar in the past year has been down 20 percent. Although there are many other reasons for a weak dollar, the war is contributing to the weakness in the dollar.

Also, during wartime the country can expect that taxes will go up. I know we are talking about cutting taxes, and I am all for cutting taxes; but in real terms taxes will go up during wartime. And it is inevitable that deficits increase. And right now our deficits are exploding. Our national debt is going up nearly \$500 billion per year at an analyzed rate.

The other shortcoming economically of wartime is that funds, once they are either borrowed, inflated or taxed, once the government spends these, so much of this expenditure is overseas, and it takes away from domestic spending. So this is a strong negative for the domestic economy. Another thing that arises during wartime so often is the sentiment for protectionism and a weak economy, difficulties with currencies in wartime will really build an incentive for protectionists measures, and we are starting to see that, which I think is a danger.

During wartime, trade is much more difficult; and so if a war comes, we can expect that even our trade balances might get much worse. There are a lot of subjective problems during wartime too. The first thing that goes is confidence. Confidence in general. Right now there is less confidence in the stock market and literally hundreds of billions of dollars lost in the stock market in the last year or two, again, due to other reasons; but the possibility of war contributes to this negative sentiment toward the stock market.

It is hard to judge the future. Nobody can know the future because of the unintended consequences of war. We do not know how long the war will last. How much it will spread? So there are a lot of uncertainties about this. There is fear. Fear comes from the potential of war or during wartime and a lot of confusion. And unfortunately, also when wars are not fought for national security reasons, the popularity of the war is questioned, that this may alienate our allies. And I believe we are seeing some of that already.